

On systematic errors due to quenching in ε'/ε

Maarten Golterman^a and Elisabetta Pallante^b

^aDepartment of Physics and Astronomy, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA 94132, USA

^bSISSA, Via Beirut 2-4, I-34013 Trieste, Italy

Recently, we pointed out that chiral transformation properties of penguin operators change in the transition from unquenched to (partially) quenched QCD. As a consequence, new operators appear in (partially) quenched QCD penguins, introducing ambiguities which should be considered a quenching artifact. Here we discuss more specifically the effects of this phenomenon on the quenched $\Delta I = 1/2$ $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitude, and in particular, its potential numerical effect on recent lattice estimates for ε'/ε .

The strong LR penguin operators $Q_{5,6}$ mediating $\Delta S = 1$, $\Delta I = 1/2$ weak transitions are of the form

$$Q_{penguin}^{QCD} \propto (\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)d)(\bar{q}\gamma_\mu(1+\gamma_5)q), \quad (1)$$

with q summed over u, d, s , and thus transform trivially under $SU(3)_R$. However, this is no longer true when one quenches the theory. The quenched theory can be defined by introducing a bosonic “ghost” quark $\tilde{q}$ for each of the three valence quarks q [1], and thus the symmetry group is enlarged to a graded group transforming all six quarks into each other, $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \rightarrow SU(3|3)_L \times SU(3|3)_R$ [2], under which $Q_{penguin}^{QCD}$ is no longer a singlet. This was observed in ref. [3], in which also the consequences for $K \rightarrow 0$ and $K \rightarrow \pi$ matrix elements were studied in ChPT, both in the fully and partially quenched cases. Here we extend the discussion to $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitudes, restricting ourselves to the quenched three-flavor theory. The partially quenched case, as well as more general results, are contained in ref. [4].

The right-handed current in eq. (1) can be split into a singlet (S) and a non-singlet (NS) part, $(\bar{q}q)_R \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\psi}\psi)_R + \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\psi}\hat{N}\psi)_R$ (in an obvious shorthand), where ψ runs over valence and ghost quarks, and $\hat{N} = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1)$. Accordingly, $Q_{penguin}^{QCD}$ splits up into a singlet and a non-singlet part Q^{QS} , resp. Q^{QNS} , which are represented in leading-order ChPT by

$$Q^{QS} \rightarrow -\alpha_{q1}^{(8,1)} \text{str}(\Lambda L_\mu L_\mu) + \alpha_{q2}^{(8,1)} \text{str}(\Lambda X_+) ,$$

$$Q^{QNS} \rightarrow f^2 \alpha^{NS} \text{str}(\Lambda \Sigma \hat{N} \Sigma^\dagger) , \quad (2)$$

with α^{NS} a new low-energy constant (LEC), which only exists in the quenched theory, and thus should be considered an artifact of the quenched approximation [3].¹ While a similar phenomenon also occurs for LL penguins, we note that in the LR case, the new non-singlet operator is $O(p^0)$ in ChPT, thus enhancing its contribution to weak matrix elements. (This is similar to the enhancement of the EM penguins $Q_{7,8}$.)

At tree level, the new operator does not contribute to matrix elements with only physical (valence) mesons on the external lines, but it does contribute at one loop, thus competing at $O(p^2)$ with the *tree-level* contributions from Q^{QS} . For the $K \rightarrow \pi$ (with degenerate masses) and $K \rightarrow 0$ matrix elements used recently by the CP-PACS [5] and RBC [6] collaborations to extract the value of $\alpha_{q1}^{(8,1)}$ we find [3]

$$\langle \pi^+ | Q_{penguin}^{QCD} | K^+ \rangle = \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{4M^2}{f^2} \left[(\alpha_{q1}^{(8,1)} - \hat{\beta}_{q1}^{NS} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\beta}_{q2}^{NS}) - (\alpha_{q2}^{(8,1)} + \hat{\beta}_{q3}^{NS}) \right] ,$$

$$\langle 0 | Q_{penguin}^{QCD} | K^0 \rangle = \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{4i}{f} \left[(M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)(\alpha_{q2}^{(8,1)} + \hat{\beta}_{q3}^{NS}) + \alpha^{NS} * \text{logs} \right] ,$$

and for the $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix element with physical

¹See also this reference for notation.

kinematics we find [4]

$$\langle \pi^+ \pi^- | Q_{\text{penguin}}^{QCD} | K^0 \rangle = \frac{4i}{f^3} \left[(M_K^2 - M_\pi^2) (\alpha_{q1}^{(8,1)} - \hat{\beta}_{q1}^{NS} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\beta}_{q2}^{NS}) + \alpha^{NS} * \text{logs} \right]. \quad (5)$$

Here $\hat{\beta}_{qi}^{NS} \equiv (4\pi)^2 \beta_{qi}^{NS}$ are $O(p^2)$ LECs which appear at next-to-leading order in the non-singlet sector, and absorb the scale dependence from the chiral logs [3]. Note that the singlet and non-singlet LECs always appear in the same linear combinations. This can be understood from the fact that only physical mesons appear on the external lines (see ref. [4] for details).

From these results, we conclude that there are at least three different strategies one could follow to estimate the real-world $\Delta I = 1/2$ decay rate from a quenched computation:

- Ignore α^{NS} , but not the $\hat{\beta}_{qi}^{NS}$. This introduces a scale dependence, but makes sense if $\alpha^{NS} * \text{logs}$ is small in the physical matrix element, at a reasonable scale. Thus $\alpha_{q1}^{(8,1)} - \hat{\beta}_{q1}^{NS} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\beta}_{q2}^{NS}$ from $K \rightarrow \pi$ and $K \rightarrow 0$ is taken as the “best” estimate of unquenched $\alpha_1^{(8,1)}$, and the physical $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix element is calculated from the unquenched expression $4i(M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)\alpha_1^{(8,1)}/f^3$. This is the strategy followed by CP-PACS and RBC [5,6].
- Drop all the non-singlet operators, following the simple prescription given in ref. [3]. This was investigated for Q_6 in ref. [7]; see below.
- Keep everything in eqs. (3-4), and also calculate the physical $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix element using eq. (5), assuming that it gives the best estimate of the real-world matrix element.

Naively, the second strategy might be considered the obvious one, since the aim is to compute the (unquenched) value of $\alpha_1^{(8,1)}$, which (at least at tree level in unquenched ChPT) determines the penguin contribution to the physical decay rate. However, we do not know whether the quenched (e.g. $\alpha_{q1}^{(8,1)}$) and unquenched (e.g. $\alpha_1^{(8,1)}$) LECs have the same values; it might happen that $\alpha_{q1}^{(8,1)} - \hat{\beta}_{q1}^{NS} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\beta}_{q2}^{NS}$ is a better estimate of $\alpha_1^{(8,1)}$. For this reason, we believe that

the spread in values obtained by following different strategies should be taken as a *systematic error* due to quenching. The origin of this uncertainty comes from the fact that in the case of electro-weak operators, defining the quenched theory as QCD with the fermion determinant set equal to a constant is *not* enough: in addition, a prescription has to be given for the “embedding” of electro-weak operators in the quenched theory [3,8]. In some cases this is straightforward, but in the case at hand it is not. Note that in the case of partially quenched QCD with three dynamical light flavors, the choice of strategy is unambiguous: the second strategy should be followed [3], since the LECs of this theory are those of unquenched QCD [9].

We will now comment on the three different strategies listed above. First, we address the issue of ignoring α^{NS} . We found that if α^{NS} , with the normalization defined in eq. (2), is of the same order as $\alpha_{q1}^{(8,1)}$, its numerical contribution to the $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix element in eq. (5) is small ($\sim 10^{-2}$ of the total), for a reasonable choice of the ChPT scale [4]. If so, this justifies ignoring α^{NS} . The reason appears to be purely numerical, and can be understood as a suppression by the typical factor $1/(4\pi)^2$ arising at one loop.

It would of course be better to determine α^{NS} from a lattice computation. In principle, it can be determined from existing data for the $K \rightarrow 0$ matrix element (*cf.* eq. (4)), but this may be difficult to do in practice, since it is hard to disentangle logs from the linear term in the quark mass at the typical values of quark masses employed in current simulations [5,6]. In fact, it is easier to determine α^{NS} from a process in which it appears at leading order in ChPT. This can be done as follows. First, rotate Q_{penguin}^{QCD} by a $SU(3|3)_L$ rotation into $(\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)\bar{d})(\bar{\psi}\hat{N}\gamma_\mu(1 + \gamma_5)\psi)$, which is in the same representation of $SU(3|3)_L \times SU(3|3)_R$. Next, consider the matrix element between a fermionic kaon $\tilde{K} \propto \bar{d}\gamma_5 s$ and the vacuum. ChPT tells us that

$$\langle 0 | (\bar{s}\bar{d})_L (\bar{\psi}\hat{N}\psi)_R | \tilde{K} \rangle = 2if^2\alpha^{NS} + O(p^2). \quad (6)$$

The key observation is that no simulations with ghost quarks are needed. After carrying out all

Wick contractions on the left-hand side of eq. (6), one simply uses the fact that ghost and valence propagators are equal, $\langle \tilde{d}(x) \bar{\tilde{d}}(y) \rangle = \langle d(x) \bar{d}(y) \rangle$, *etc.* Estimating α^{NS} is thus as simple as estimating $\alpha_{2q}^{(8,1)}$, once the usual valence-quark propagators have been computed. It is important to determine α^{NS} in order to see whether indeed its contribution can be considered a small effect.

The remaining choice of strategy boils down to whether one considers $\alpha_{1q}^{(8,1)}$ or $\alpha_{1q}^{(8,1)} - \hat{\beta}_{q1}^{NS} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\beta}_{q2}^{NS}$ to be a better estimate of unquenched $\alpha_1^{(8,1)}$. Since the issue only arises for QCD penguins, and is a non-leading effect in ChPT for the LL case [3], it is unlikely to have much influence on the real part of the $\Delta I = 1/2$ amplitude. This is not the case for ε'/ε , where Q_6 is expected to be one of the largest contributions. In ref. [7] it was found, following the simple prescription for dropping non-singlet operators given in ref. [3] (and using staggered fermions, while refs. [5,6] used domain-wall fermions), that leaving out the non-singlet operator in Q_6 enhances $B_6^{(1/2)}$ by a factor two at the kaon mass. To leading order in ChPT, this means that $\alpha_{1q}^{(8,1)}$ is twice as large as $\alpha_{1q}^{(8,1)} - \hat{\beta}_{q1}^{NS} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\beta}_{q2}^{NS}$, potentially enhancing the contribution of Q_6 to ε'/ε by a factor two relative to the contributions found in refs. [5,6].

No estimate of this enhancement with domain-wall fermions is available. In order to get an idea of how large the effect on ε'/ε can be, we therefore consider what a factor-two enhancement of $B_6^{(1/2)}$ would imply for the central value of $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon = -4 \times 10^{-4}$ reported by RBC [6]. We find that this value would shift to $+10 \times 10^{-4}$. Considering the CP-PACS results [5] the situation is less clear. They typically find a smaller (in absolute value) negative contribution from Q_6 , and there appears to be a stronger dependence on quark mass. When we take their value of -2×10^{-4} at a degenerate Goldstone-boson mass of about 600 MeV, we find that enhancing $B_6^{(1/2)}$ by a factor two changes this into $+2 \times 10^{-4}$.

We emphasize that these are rather unreliable estimates of the effect of keeping or dropping the non-singlet operators in Q_6 . Many other effects are not under control, such as the fact that

all computations were done at only one value of the lattice spacing, and that our estimates rely on leading-order ChPT, to mention but a few. However, these estimates do make it clear that the issue is important, not only theoretically, but also phenomenologically. While the quenched approximation does remarkably well in “simple” strong interaction physics, such as the light hadron spectrum, it is a major obstacle to obtaining phenomenologically relevant estimates of finely-tuned quantities like ε'/ε . Partially quenched computations with three dynamical light flavors are needed in order to resolve the ambiguities introduced by quenching.

Finally, we recall that similar ambiguities also affect Q_5 and strong LL penguins. However, these are expected to be numerically less important. For Q_5 the effect occurs at leading order in ChPT, just as for Q_6 , but the corresponding Wilson coefficient in the weak $\Delta S = 1$ hamiltonian is much smaller, suppressing the contribution of Q_5 altogether. For LL penguin operators, the effect is non-leading in ChPT, and affects $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements only at $O(p^4)$.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank N. Christ, R. Mawhinney, M. Savage and S. Sharpe for discussions. EP thanks the Dept. of Physics and Astronomy of San Francisco State University for hospitality. MG is supported in part by the US Dept. of Energy; EP was supported in part by the Italian MURST under the program *Fenomenologia delle Interazioni Fondamentali*.

REFERENCES

1. A. Morel, J. Physique 48 (1987) 111
2. C. Bernard, M. Golterman, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 853
3. M. Golterman, E. Pallante, JHEP 0110 (2001) 037
4. M. Golterman, E. Pallante, in preparation
5. J. Noaki *et al.* (CP-PACS coll.), hep-lat/0108013
6. T. Blum *et al.* (RBC coll.), hep-lat/0110075
7. T. Bhattacharya *et al.*, hep-lat/0111004
8. J. Chen, M. Savage, Phys. Rev. D65 (2002) 094001
9. S. Sharpe, N. Shores, Phys. Rev. D62 (2000) 094503